



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,913	08/12/2004	Paul McMahan	014682.000011	4912
44870	7590	05/12/2009	EXAMINER	
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM			FEARER, MARK D	
P.O. Box 13706			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			2443	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/710,913	MCMAHAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	MARK D. FEARER	2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-16,20,21 and 40-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-16,20,21,40,43,44,46-47,50-52,54 and 56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 41,42,45,48-49,53 and 55 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's Amendment filed 23 February 2009 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-2, 5-16, 20-21, and 40-46 have been amended.
3. Claims 47-56 are new.
4. Claims 1-2, 5-16, 20-21 and 40-56 are pending in the present application.
5. This action is made FINAL.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 41-42, 45, 48-49, 53, and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Consider claim 48, as applied to claim 47. The best prior art found during the examination of the present application, Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) and in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1), fails to disclose the combined claimed limitations of a rule permitting the instant messaging conversation to be interrupted in response to interrupts being selectively permitted and the interrupting contact having an interrupt priority ranking at

least as high as an interrupt priority ranking of each of the contacts and independent of the location of the communications devices being used by each of contacts.

Consider claim 49, as applied to claim 47. The best prior art found during the examination of the present application, Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) and in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1), fails to disclose the combined claimed limitations of interrupt rules comprising a rule permitting the instant messaging conversation to be interrupted in response to interrupts being selectively permitted and the interrupting conversation having a higher interrupt priority ranking than an interrupt priority ranking of the instant messaging conversation and independent of the location of a communications device being used by each of the contacts.

Consider claim 53, as applied to claim 52. The best prior art found during the examination of the present application, Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) and in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1), fails to disclose the claimed limitation of sending a contact busy message to the interrupting contact in response to one of the interrupting contact having an interrupt priority ranking no higher than each of the at least two contacts or the interrupting conversation having an interrupt priority ranking no higher than the interrupt priority ranking of the instant messaging conversation.

Consider claim 55, as applied to claim 52. The best prior art found during the examination of the present application, Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) and in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1), fails to disclose the claimed limitation of sending an interrupt notification to any of the at least two contacts of the instant messaging conversation not contacted by the interrupting contact in response to interrupting the instant messaging conversation.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1, 5, 10, 16, 40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) and in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1).

Consider claims 1, 5 as applied to claim 1, 10 as applied to claim 1, 16, 40, 43 as applied to claim 40, 47, and 52. Brandenberg et al. discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level, and a method of blocking interrupt requests ((“Because of the digital nature of the network, there exists a need to represent realworld information, such as that described above in section 2, as digital content that a computer can store, manipulate and transmit. Information can be represented as digital content in many different textual and graphical forms. For example, a restaurant establishment may publish its address and times during which the establishment is open to patrons in a simple textual format or by generating graphical advertisements for potential patrons to see. People may wish to

make their context information available in a textual format and even a picture accessible in a graphical format. Communications such as instant messages and e-mail are typically represented in a textual format. Events such as concerts and movies are typically represented in audio or video formats. The network platform is content-centric, in that it provides a context-based vehicle for routing, packaging, presenting, and interacting with content. The network platform utilizes an expanded definition of content that treats (1) everything that is displayed on, or potentially displayed on, the screen; and (2) user requests as items of content. This content-centric perspective enables a wide variety of things, all considered content items by the platform to be treated by the system in the same uniform, but flexible, way. In essence this approach creates an organic system populated by content items that are treated and behave as living organisms. In this system content items can self-route and self-organize. This approach provides a unique and elegant layering between content presentation mechanisms and content delivery, packaging, and scheduling mechanisms.") paragraphs 0300-0301 ("3.A.1.a. Meta-data (wrapper): Additionally, the content of messages A through G may be analyzed and "coded" as corresponding to particular types of content. For example, the communication of message B relates to content subjects X, Y. Additionally, the advertisement of message E from merchant 2 relates to content L, M. In practice, the network may manage hundreds or thousands of categories of subject matter. The network may require that members, including users and merchants, enter or select category designations or key words in order to allow sorting and analysis of the message. Alternatively, a software agent could be established which parses the content

of the message and infers its content. This would lessen the burden on the merchant and the users but may result in some misidentification or miscategorization of the digital content. In accordance with the present invention, privacy, preference, and content information is utilized in order to filter, accelerate, prioritize, or block particular types of content. Additionally, as has been discussed previously, location information may also be an important basis for transmitting, sorting, or prioritizing communications.") paragraphs 0305-0306 ("xiv. Is Interruptive Flag: A binary value, i.e., "yes" or "no," indicating whether or not the presentation package can interrupt the normal flow of content on the device screen. Interruptive content may have the effect of replacing currently playing content on the screen before that content is finished.") paragraph 0352). However, Brandenberg et al. fails to disclose a method of determining at least one of whether the interrupting contact has an interrupt priority ranking higher than, or at least as high as, an interrupt priority ranking of each of the at least two contacts participating in the ongoing instant messaging conversation and whether an interrupting conversation has a higher priority compared to the ongoing instant messaging conversation. Erb et al. discloses a method of call redirection zones for wireless communications wherein the interrupting contact has an interrupt priority ranking higher than, or at least as high as, an interrupt priority ranking of each of the at least two contacts participating in the ongoing instant messaging conversation and whether an interrupting conversation has a higher priority compared to the ongoing instant messaging conversation (paragraph 0026).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a method of call redirection zones for wireless communications wherein the interrupting contact has an interrupt priority ranking higher than, or at least as high as, an interrupt priority ranking of each of the at least two contacts participating in the ongoing instant messaging conversation and whether an interrupting conversation has a higher priority compared to the ongoing instant messaging conversation as taught by Erb et al. with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level, and a method of blocking interrupt requests as taught by Brandenberg et al. for the purpose of managing interrupts in a chat session.

However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a system or method wherein receiving an interrupt request from an interrupting contact during an ongoing instant messaging conversation is between at least two contacts each using a communications device, wherein the interrupt request is received by at least one of the at least two contacts; and independent of a location of the communications device being used by each of the at least two contacts.

Brown et al. discloses a system and method of controlling throughput of message requests in a messaging system wherein receiving an interrupt request from an interrupting contact during an ongoing instant messaging conversation is between at least two contacts each using a communications device, wherein the interrupt request is received by at least one of the at least two contacts; and independent of a location of

the communications device being used by each of the at least two contacts ((“A method, system and program for controlling and specifying throughput of message requests in a messaging system are provided. A “messaging session” preferably includes, but is not limited to, any combination of voice, graphical, video, and/or text messages, instant and/or delayed, transmitted between multiple users via a network. Messaging sessions may include use of chat rooms, instant messages, e-mail, IRC, conference calling and other network methods of providing a channel for users to communicate within. Further, messaging sessions may include communications such as voice, video, and text transmissions between multiple telephony devices. A “message request” may include, but is not limited to, a request for a user to join a chat session, a request for a user to participate in an instant messaging session, a request for a user to join a telephone conversation, and other requests for user to participate in a messaging session. In particular, a message request may be transmitted to a receiving user according to the receiving user's user identification (ID), screen name, telephone number, e-mail address, network location, or other identifier by which a message request may be routed to the intended receiving user.”) paragraphs 0042-0043).

Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a prior art method of call redirection zones for wireless communications wherein the interrupting contact has an interrupt priority ranking higher than, or at least as high as, an interrupt priority ranking of each of the at least two contacts participating in the ongoing instant messaging conversation and whether an interrupting conversation has a higher priority compared to the ongoing instant messaging conversation, and a system and method for managing

interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level, and a method of blocking interrupt requests upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an improvement.

Brown et al. teaches a prior art comparable system and method of controlling throughput of message requests in a messaging system wherein receiving an interrupt request from an interrupting contact during an ongoing instant messaging conversation is between at least two contacts each using a communications device, wherein the interrupt request is received by at least one of the at least two contacts; and independent of a location of the communications device being used by each of the at least two contacts.

Thus, the manner of enhancing a particular device (system and method of controlling throughput of message requests in a messaging system wherein receiving an interrupt request from an interrupting contact during an ongoing instant messaging conversation is between at least two contacts each using a communications device, wherein the interrupt request is received by at least one of the at least two contacts; and independent of a location of the communications device being used by each of the at least two contacts) was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in Brown et al. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known improvement technique in the same manner to the prior art method of call redirection zones for wireless communications wherein the interrupting contact has an interrupt priority

ranking higher than, or at least as high as, an interrupt priority ranking of each of the at least two contacts participating in the ongoing instant messaging conversation and whether an interrupting conversation has a higher priority compared to the ongoing instant messaging conversation, and a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level, and a method of blocking interrupt requests of Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized a system and method of prioritizing interrupts in a chat session.

**9.** Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Kirkland et al. (US 20050149622 A1).

Consider claim 2 and as applied to claim 1. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a method wherein a user must exceed a threshold value to make an interrupt request ("3.A.1.a.2.b. Sensitivities: Sensitivities are the second major structure of the wrapper. Sensitivities are expressed as context variable value conditions that are important to the content package. Matches between these value

conditions and the current context trigger changes in content-related behaviors and computations.") Brandenberg et al., paragraph 0334). However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a method wherein the content of the interrupting session comprises a priority ranking. Kirkland et al. discloses instant messaging priority filtering based on content and hierachal schemes wherein message content holds a priority level ("Messages related to mowing the lawn are configured to have a priority level below a delivery threshold. In other words, the user may configure the instant messaging client to delay delivery of messages having a priority level below a certain threshold. The client software may be configured to maintain a database of delayed messages. Alternatively, the delayed messages may be appended to their appropriate queues, however, the user must manually view those queues or lower his or her priority threshold. Additionally, the message may be delivered, but display schemes such as using flashing messages to catch the user's attention may be delayed. Joe may configure these low priority messages to be delivered at a later time when Joe has lowered the delivery threshold. Thus, Joe is able to reorder incoming messages according to content priority, and allow/disallow interrupts along the lines of those priorities.") paragraph 0052).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate instant messaging priority filtering based on content and hierachal schemes wherein message content holds a priority level as taught by Kirkland et al. with a method wherein a user must exceed a threshold value to

make an interrupt request as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of managing interrupts.

**10.** Claims 6-7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Brewer et al. (US 5611040 A).

Consider claims 6, 20 and 54, as applied to claims 1, 16 and claim 54, respectively. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window (Brandenberg et al., paragraphs 0300-0301). However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a communication method comprising presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) representation of the interrupting conversation in a foreground of a display in response to interrupting the instant messaging conversation, and transferring a keyboard focus to a type-in box of the interrupting conversation in response to interrupting the instant messaging conversation. Brewer et al. discloses a system and method for activating double click applications with a single click comprising placing a window in the foreground and taking control of the mouse and keyboard ("Another instance where not having to click is a desirable goal is when, for example, as user

desires to "drag and drop" an object into a window which currently is not under "focus". Focus is where a window is essentially placed in the foreground which, in a multitasking environment, refers to the process (program) that has control of the console and responds to commands issued from the mouse or keyboard.") column 1 lines 56-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a system and method for activating double click applications with a single click comprising placing a window in the foreground and taking control of the mouse and keyboard as taught by Brewer et al. with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of single instance application.

Consider claims 7 and 56, as applied to claims 1 and 52, respectively. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a communication method comprising presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) representation of the interrupting conversation to the background of a display in response to interrupting the instant messaging conversation. Brewer et al. discloses a system and method for activating double click applications with

a single click comprising placing a window in the background ((“In the exemplary embodiment of the present invention, for the single click (i.e., button down then up) to be interpreted as a double click, the single click should occur within a preset double click time and range. As mentioned in the BACKGROUND, this time and range have default settings but can also be updated by a user via a mouse control window as shown in FIG. 2.”) column 3 lines 59-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a system and method for activating double click applications with a single click comprising placing a window in the background as taught by Brewer et al. with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of single instance application.

**11.** Claims 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Asokan (US 20050220079 A1).

Consider claims 8 and 21, and as applied to claims 1 and 16, respectively. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for

managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a messaging system comprising interrupts wherein other participants in a session are notified when someone else receives an interrupt request. Asokan discloses a system and method for suspending packet-switched sessions to a wireless terminal comprising a method wherein participants in a session are notified when a terminal has become unavailable ((“In some embodiments of the present invention, the packet-switched session may be a push-to-talk session that has been initiated by a user of a GSM/GPRS wireless terminal and that was established by a push-to-talk server. In response to receiving a circuit-switched page, the wireless terminal via, for example, a push-to-talk application that is running on the terminal, notifies the push-to-talk server that the push-to-talk session is to be temporarily suspended. This notification may be forwarded, for example, as either a text message or an e-mail message that is transmitted over the SMS data bearer. The message may include, for example, an identifier associated with the cellular telephone (e.g., a push-to-talk client ID), identification of the reason the push-to-talk session is being suspended, the expected interval of the suspension, etc. If other participants in the push-to-talk session attempt to communicate with the wireless terminal over the push-to-talk session during the period when the wireless terminal has suspended the session, the push-to-talk server may notify those participants that the wireless terminal is temporarily unavailable. In other embodiments of the present invention, such notice may automatically be provided in response to the push-to-talk server receiving notification

that a terminal has temporarily suspended participation in an on-going push-to-talk session. The notification to other participants in the push-to-talk session, if provided, may be generated and forwarded by the wireless terminal and/or the push-to-talk server.") paragraph 0038).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a system and method for suspending packet-switched sessions to a wireless terminal comprising a method wherein participants in a session are notified when a terminal has become unavailable as taught by Asokan with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of event notification.

**12.** Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Balasuriya et al. (US 20050245240 A1).

Consider claim 9, and as applied to claim 1 above. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a

messaging dialog window. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a system or method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein an interrupted instant messaging system resumes upon completion of the interrupt.

Balasuriya et al. discloses an apparatus and method for storing media during interruption of a media session wherein a session can resume when an interruption ends ((“The disclosure provides an apparatus for and method of storing subsequent streaming media in a memory associated with a wireless communication device in response to receiving a communication request. For example, the disclosure provides for selectively storing at least one media of a multicast or unicast session in a local memory of a wireless communication device when a media streaming session is interrupted by an event, such as an incoming call. A user of the wireless communication device can resume playing the session from the local memory when the interruption ends.”) paragraph 0013).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an apparatus and method for storing media during interruption of a media session wherein a session can resume when an interruption ends as taught by Balasuriya et al. with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of seamless collaboration.

**13.** Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Horvitz et al. (US 2005084082 A1).

Consider claims 11 and 12, and as applied to claims 1 and 11, respectively. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a system or method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein interrupts can be selectively blocked or overridden. Horvitz et al. (US 2005084082 A1) discloses designs, interfaces, and policies for systems that enhance communication and minimize disruption by encoding preferences and situations wherein interruptability can be assigned and bypassed (read as overridden) ("Interruptability can be assigned to the various created groups. For example, after defining and activating a groups and assessing the priorities of callers, users can optionally assess their background or default interruptability (e.g., for a typical week). Default interruptability can represent the cost of taking phone calls at different times of day and days of the week in situations where there is no further statement about context, for example. Users can assert their background cost of interruption via a time-pattern palette as illustrated in FIG. 8. This palette allows users to sweep out regions of low, medium, and high cost of interruption over a seven-day period. Users can also

indicate which periods of time should be set to block calls. At these times, only users assigned breakthrough privileges can get through to the user. Users typically are instructed that they can bypass this palette, thus assuming a background low cost of interruption for substantially all times.") paragraph 0077 ("It is to be appreciated that the respective interfaces described herein can be provided in various other settings and context. For example, the interfaces can be GUIs associated with various applications, including a mail application, a calendar application and/or a web browser, models (e.g., as discussed herein), and/or a desktop development tool. The GUIs can provide a display with one or more display objects, including aspects as configurable icons, buttons, sliders, input boxes, selection options, menus, tabs and so forth with multiple configurable dimensions, shapes, colors, text, data and sounds to facilitate operations with the applications and/or models. In addition, the GUIs can include a plurality of other inputs and/or controls for adjusting and/or configuring one or more aspects of the present invention, as described in more detail below. As an example, the GUIs can provide for receiving user commands from a mouse, keyboard, speech input, web site, remote web service, pattern recognizer, face recognizer, and/or other device such as a camera or video input to effect or modify operations of the GUI.") paragraph 0108).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate designs, interfaces, and policies for systems that enhance communication and minimize disruption by encoding preferences and situations wherein interruptability can be assigned and bypassed as taught by Horvitz et al. (US 2005084082 A1) with a system and method for managing

interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of interactive collaboration.

**14.** Claims 13-14, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Savage et al. (US 20010009014 A1).

Consider claims 13-14, and as applied to claims 1 and 13, respectively, and 50, as applied to claim 47. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window in an instant messaging contacts list in a user's communications device ("3.F.3. Types of Arrangements: Users occasionally need to view homogenous collections of content objects formed on the basis of inherent category membership (e.g., an arrangement of all people). Traditional business-related functionality found on PDA's and desktops is designed around access to homogenous sets of information (e.g., contact lists or address books, message lists, to do lists, event lists or calendars). These are very useful for reference, but they do not satisfy the need people have to be aware of various kinds of information, especially when the set of information itself needs to adapt in

response to changes in the present context. At any given time users have the need to bring together collections of content that are diverse. Using arrangements manages to satisfy both with the same interaction model.") Brandenberg et al., paragraph 0547). However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a system or method for managing interruptions to network users wherein interrupt ranking is assigned to all users or ranking is performed by a predetermined order. Savage et al. discloses facilitating real-time, multi-point communications over the internet wherein a scheduler keeps track of and maintains the priority of each participant in each conference ((“According to a specific embodiment, the scheduler keeps track of and maintains the priority of each participant in each conference. That is, the scheduler maintains the priority field in each atom for each participant. According to one embodiment, the priority field of a participant's atoms changes dynamically according to a fairness algorithm which monitors the amount of talking by a particular client. That is, the longer a client talks the lower its priority decays, while the less a client talks, the higher its priority remains. This gives high priority, for example to a client which interrupts another that has been talking for awhile. According to a more specific embodiment, hysteresis is also built into the system to allow a client to build its priority back.”) paragraph 0102).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate facilitating real-time, multi-point communications over the internet wherein a scheduler keeps track of and maintains the priority of each participant in each conference as taught by Savage et al. with a system

and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of availability rules.

**15.** Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Suorsa et al. (US 20020156831 A1).

Consider claim 15, and as applied to claim 1 above. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a system or method for managing interruptions to network users wherein Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) decides the priority of interrupt requests. Suorsa et al. discloses automated provisioning of computing networks using a network database data model wherein Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) verifies the access level of an agent ("Thus, the present invention provides a technique whereby the validity of a message or a command transmitted to an agent may be verified. This verification, in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention may be accomplished using a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP). Additionally, in

accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, the access level of the agent may be verified by the system by way of a convenient communications protocol, such as LDAP or the like.”) paragraph 0065).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate automated provisioning of computing networks using a network database data model wherein Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) verifies the access level of an agent as taught by with a system and method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session comprising a messaging dialog window as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of managing interrupts.

**16.** Claims 44, 46, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brandenberg et al. (US 20030063072 A1) in further view of Erb et al. (US 20040142703 A1) in further view of Brown et al. (US 20030055908 A1) and in further view of Horvitz et al. (US 20050132014 A1).

Consider claim 44, as applied to claim 40. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., discloses a method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level. However, Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., fails to disclose a method comprising representing the contacts list as a graphical user interface including a table comprising one column for indicating an online status of each contact in the contacts lists and another column for an interrupt priority ranking of each

contact. Horvitz et al. discloses statistical models and methods to support the personalization of applications and services via consideration of preference encodings of a community of users comprising online status of contacts and an interrupt priority ranking (paragraphs 0030-0031).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate statistical models and methods to support the personalization of applications and services via consideration of preference encodings of a community of users comprising online status of contacts and an interrupt priority ranking as taught by Horvitz et al. with a method for managing interruptions to a network user wherein two users are communicating in a chat session, and an interrupt request is received with a user defined urgency level as taught by Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al., for the purpose of user profiling.

Consider claims 46 as applied to claim 40, and 51 as applied to claim 47. Brandenberg et al., as modified by Erb et al. and Horvitz et al., further disclose a method comprising presenting a graphical user interface to each participant in an active instant messaging conversation, wherein the graphical user interface comprises an input means to enter or select a priority of the active instant messaging conversation (Horvitz et al., paragraph 0007).

***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments filed 23 February 2009 with respect to claims 1-2, 5-16, 20-21, 43-44, and 46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

**Customer Service Window**  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Mark Fearer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1770. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Mark Fearer  
/M.D.F./  
May 1, 2009

/George C Neurauter, Jr./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443